

**REMARKS**

**N.B.** The Examiner has not acknowledged Applicant's claim for foreign priority or receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. Applicant's filing letter presented the claim for foreign priority which also is acknowledged on the Official Filing Receipt. Attached is a copy of the Notice of Acceptance... mailed January 12, 2006, and acknowledging receipt of the "Priority Documents filed on 07/21/2005".

Applicant amends the specification to correct some possible informalities therein.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objections to the disclosure and to claim 15, in view of the above amendments to the specification which explicitly identify the structures which perform the functions of the means-plus-function elements in the claims.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, in view of the above cancellation of the parent claims 14 and 15, and further in view of the new independent parent claim 19 which is drafted to overcome the Examiner's stated ground in support of this rejection.

Claims 10-15, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ziembra '307.

Claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, **16 (16/15/14)**, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Armbruster '511.

To summarize the effect of the above claim amendments, Applicant notes that the limitations of the canceled claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and **16** have been incorporated in the new

independent parent claim **19**, thereby rendering **moot** the rejection which is based on **Ziemba** and which is **not applied to claim 16**. In any event, in the Ziemba system, a rotatable ring 27 actuates jaws 51, 52 or 71-74, to secure the syringe body projection 45 to the front face of the injector. In particular, when the syringe is in its secured position, rotation of the ring 27 is necessary to unlock the syringe.

With respect to the rejection based on Armbruster '511, Applicant again notes that the new independent parent claim 19 in effect combines the limitations of the canceled claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16 (and new dependent claim 20 further defines the "reception direction" as being "directed upwardly").

Applicant, in addition to traversing the rejection based on Ziemba '307, also respectfully **traverses** the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on anticipation by Armbruster '511, insofar as this rejection may be applied to the new independent parent claim 19 and its dependent claims 12, 17, 18 and 20, for the following reasons.

The rejection based on anticipation requires that Armbruster '511 disclose, either expressly or inherently, each limitation of the parent claim 19 (and its dependent claims), or in other words, that claim 19 (and its dependent claims) be **readable** on Armbruster's disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that clearly such is **not** the case here.

More specifically, the "angiographic injection system" as claimed in independent parent claim 19 comprises *inter alia*, the following combination of the features :

(a) the proximal end of the syringe body comprises a projection constituted by two diametrically-opposite tabs;

(b) the syringe piston has means for releasably coupling the piston to the front head of the injector pusher;

(c) the support device secured to the front face of the injector includes a recess which comprises a central portion that is circularly arcuate and that is extended by two diametrically-opposite notches, each receiving and positioning a tab of the syringe body;

(d) the recess central portion extends the inside surface of the supported device cradle;

(e) turning the secured syringe through 90° causes it to be lifted by one of the tabs cooperating with the bottom of the associated notch, then with said central portion, whereby the piston and the pusher are disconnected; and

(f) the syringe is then removable in a forward direction, even if the pusher is engaged inside the syringe body, by a sliding movement of said one tab along said central portion then along said inside surface of the cradle.

Turning now to Armbruster, there is an essential difference between the subject matter of new claim 19 and the Armbruster system: in the latter, as best seen in Figure 10 of Armbruster, the recess 72 of the support device 16 has a circularly arcuate central portion which is **recessed** with respect to the inside surface of the cradle. As a result, when, starting from a secured position of the syringe (Figures 1-4), the syringe is rotated by 90° and the syringe tabs 52 cooperate with the bottom of the recess 72, but the lowermost tab 52, which engages this central portion of the recess 72, is located at a level lower than that of the lowermost generatrix of the cradle.

**Consequently, it is necessary to manually lift the syringe to remove it forwardly.**

On the other hand, in the claimed system (claim 19), "the central portion [of the recess] **extends** the inside surface of the cradle", which means that both surfaces are flush which each other. As a result, as soon as the syringe has been turned by 90°, it can be removed forwardly by a mere sliding movement.

Finally, the syringe is very precisely guided, and it can be readily removed from the injector.

Thus, since the independent parent claim 19 (and its dependent claims) clearly is **not readable** on Armbruster's disclosure, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 (and its dependent claims) is **not anticipated** by Armbruster's disclosure, whereby Applicant also respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Armbruster.

In summary, then, and for the reasons indicated above, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the disclosure, the objection to claim 15, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the two rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on anticipation by Ziemba '307 and Armbruster '511, and to find the application to be in condition for **allowance** with all the presently pending **claims 19, 12, 17, 18 and 20**; however, if for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant files concurrently herewith a Petition (with fee) for an Extension of Time of three months (small entity). Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. APPLN. NO. 10/542,989

required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/John H. Mion/  
John H. Mion  
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213  
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 5, 2007